

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
HAMMOND DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	2:10-cr-00165-PPS
)	
CHARLES D. WOODWORTH)	

OPINION AND ORDER

Defendant Charles D. Woodworth pled guilty to one count of a multiple-count indictment relating to fraud on the government on June 2, 2011. On November 1, 2011 I sentenced Woodworth to three years of probation with both standard and special conditions, and judgment was entered shortly thereafter. (Docket Entries 27, 28.) On November 5, 2013 Woodworth moved for early termination of probation. (DE 29.) Upon my order (DE 30), the U.S. Attorney's Office (DE 32) and U.S. Probation Office (DE 31) responded to Woodworth's motion, the former opposing it and the latter supporting it. Having considered the motion and responses, and finding it in the interests of justice to do so, I hereby **GRANT** Woodworth's Motion for Early Termination of Probation. (DE 29.)

Woodworth has successfully completed two years of his probation and complied with all of its terms, including serving his term of home detention, doing his community service and paying his fine and special assessment. The Probation Office supports early termination of probation, stating that Woodworth meets the established criteria and it would be in the interests of justice. (DE 31.) There is no indication that Woodworth has ever violated any term of his sentence.

The government opposes the motion, arguing that probation has a punitive element and Woodworth should complete all three years of probation in order to receive the full punishment he is due. (DE 32.)

I disagree with the government's argument. My primary goal in sentencing Woodworth to a term of probation was to ensure that he did not engage in any further illegal behavior. Woodworth's term of home detention, community service hours and fine involved punitive elements, and Woodworth successfully fulfilled these. Given the budget constraints under which our Probation Office works, Woodworth has demonstrated that Probation's resources would be better used elsewhere, rather than supervising someone who does not need to be supervised.

For the foregoing reasons, I hereby **GRANT** Woodworth's Motion for Early Termination of Probation. (DE 29.)

SO ORDERED.

ENTERED: December 6, 2013

/s/ Philip P. Simon
PHILIP P. SIMON, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT